

MINUTES

JUNE 9, 2015

PLANNING BOARD

LONG HILL TOWNSHIP

CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Pfeil called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. He then read the following statement: Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board, by sending a copy to the Courier News and Echoes-Sentinel and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk, all in January 2015.

MEETING CUT-OFF

Chairman Pfeil read the following statement: Announcement is made that as a matter of procedure, it is the intention of the Planning Board not to continue any matter past 10:30 p.m. at any Regular or Special Meeting of the Board unless a motion is passed by the members present to extend the meeting to a later specified cut-off time.

CELL PHONES AND PAGERS

Chairman Pfeil read the following statement: All in attendance are requested to turn off cell phones and pagers as they interfere with the court room taping mechanism.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

On a call of the roll, the following were Present:

J. Alan Pfeil, Chairman
Brendan Rae, Mayor
David Hands, Member
Ashish Moholkar, Member
Guy Piserchia, Member (7:34 p.m.)
Guy Roshto, Member
Timothy Wallisch, Member

Kevin O'Brien, Board Planner
Cynthia Kiefer, Board Secretary

Excused:

Suzanne Dapkins, V. Chair
Gregory Aroneo, Member

Thomas Lemanowicz, Bd. Engr.
Daniel Bernstein, Board Attorney

Ms. Kiefer advised Chairman Pfeil that he had a quorum and could proceed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION – It was determined that there was no need to hold an executive session.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kiefer advised Chairman Pfeil that she had one (1) correction in the minutes of the March 10, 2015 Regular Meeting. On page 10, paragraph 10, it stated, "Mr. Roshto stated that the Master Plan was scheduled to be completed in 2016. His goal was to have a preliminary draft presented to this board in **October 2016.**" It should have read "**October 2015.**"

Ms. Kiefer noted that Mr. Piserchia had arrived at 7:34 PM.

Mr. Moholkar moved to approve the minutes as amended and Mr. Roshto seconded the motion. A **ROLL CALL VOTE** was taken. Those in Favor: Mr. Hands, Mr. Moholkar, Mr. Piserchia, Mr. Roshto. Those Opposed: NONE. The minutes as amended were approved unanimously. Chairman Pfeil, Mayor Rae and Mr. Wallisch were ineligible to vote since they were not in attendance at that meeting.

Mr. Roshto moved approval of the minutes as written of the Executive Session of March 10, 2015. Mr. Moholkar seconded the motion. A **ROLL CALL VOTE** was taken. Those in Favor: Mr. Hands, Mr. Moholkar, Mr. Piserchia, Mr. Roshto. Those Opposed: NONE. The Executive Session minutes were approved unanimously as written. Chairman Pfeil, Mayor Rae and Mr. Wallisch were ineligible to vote since they were not in attendance at that meeting.

Mr. Wallisch moved approval of the minutes of March 24, 2015 as written. Chairman Pfeil seconded the motion. A **ROLL CALL VOTE** was taken. All those in Favor: Mayor Rae, Mr. Moholkar, Mr. Piserchia, Mr. Roshto, Mr. Wallisch, Chairman Pfeil. Those Opposed: NONE. The minutes of March 24, 2015 were approved unanimously as written. Mr. Hands was ineligible to vote since he was not in attendance at that meeting.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS OR COMMENT PERIOD

Chairman Pfeil opened the meeting to the public for questions or comments on items not listed on the agenda. Hearing none, he closed the meeting.

RESOLUTION OF MEMORIALIZATION (amended)

JOEL H. & ROBERTA L. GOLDBERG
47 Overlook Road
Block 12502, Lot 8

#15-01P
Minor Subdivision
Bulk Variance

Chairman Pfeil stated that the amendment to this resolution was an explanation of the exemption of the current sewer ban. The board attorney, Mr. Bernstein, and the township's attorney, Mr. Pidgeon, had worked together to come up with the appropriate language for the resolution and inserted it in Item 10b on page 5. According to Mr. O'Brien, everyone involved was satisfied with that language. That was the only change from the original resolution.

Mr. Wallisch moved approval and Mr. Roshto seconded. A **ROLL CALL VOTE** was taken. Those in Favor: Mr. Piserchia, Mr. Roshto, Mr. Wallisch, Chairman Pfeil. Those Opposed: NONE. The resolution was approved unanimously. Mr. Hands, Mr. Moholkar and Mayor Rae were ineligible to vote since they did not vote on the application.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE #343-15 - "Approving updated zoning map and amending Section 121 of the Township Land Use Code entitled Zone Districts"

Chairman Pfeil advised the board members that this ordinance had come to the Planning Board after its first reading by the Township Committee.

Mr. O'Brien added that the zoning map had been created by the township engineer, Paul Ferriero, and presented to the Township Committee. The Planning Board now had 35 days to either recommend or not recommend the ordinance back to the Township Committee. The Township Committee would then have a second reading and decide whether or not to pass it. He felt that the new map reflected the zones as they currently existed and that the board should take that into consideration in its deliberations.

Mr. Roshto thanked both Mr. O'Brien and Dennis Sandow for all their help in creating the new map.

Mr. Roshto then motioned that the Planning Board find that the ordinance was consistent with the Master Plan and therefore recommend it to the Township Committee. Mr. Moholkar seconded the motion. A **ROLL CALL VOTE** was taken. Those in Favor: Mayor Rae, Mr. Hands, Mr. Moholkar, Mr. Piserchia, Mr. Roshto, Mr. Wallisch, Chairman Pfeil. Those Opposed: NONE. The motion to recommend the ordinance to the Township Committee was approved unanimously.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE #357-15 – "An ordinance adopting amendments to the Township Land Use Ordinance as recommended by the Planning Board"

Chairman Pfeil advised the board members that this ordinance had originated with the Planning Board and had been called the "Clarification Ordinance." It specifically dealt with permitting and stormwater. He had presented it to the Township Committee and he noted that Mr. Lemanowicz had done an excellent job explaining the differences between the current stormwater management ordinances and what was being proposed. It had gone through first reading at the Township Committee level.

Mr. Wallisch asked if this ordinance clarified the issues with what coverage counted towards impervious and pervious coverage with respect to driveways and parking lots.

Chairman Pfeil explained that they had removed the word "pervious" so as to eliminate any conflict.

Mr. O'Brien added that they stayed with the "no net increase" requirement for stormwater. This document, in a very few pages, brought up to date the township's rules concerning stormwater management. The old ordinance referenced out of date documents and documents that no longer existed.

Mr. Wallisch motioned that the Planning Board find that the ordinance was consistent with the Master Plan and therefore recommend it to the Township Committee. Mr. Hands seconded the motion. A **ROLL CALL VOTE** was taken. Those in Favor: Mayor Rae, Mr. Hands, Mr. Moholkar, Mr. Piserchia, Mr. Roshto, Mr. Wallisch, Chairman Pfeil. Those Opposed: NONE. The motion was approved unanimously.

TIFA, LTD., PRESENTATION - Discussion on "Street Frontage Improvements"

Present: Gregory Perry, P.P., Supervising Planner, Morris County Planning Board

Chairman Pfeil stated that late that morning or early that afternoon Dawn Wolfe, Planning and Zoning Administrator, had received a letter from David Roberts, attorney for Tifa. The letter said that Tifa's

contract purchaser had completed its environmental review and had notified Tifa that it intended to move forward with the transaction. Within days the transaction would be submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection (D.E.P.) for its final approval. The letter stated that it was significant that the D.E.P.'s prior objections had been dealt with so its approval seemed inevitable. As a result Mr. Roberts felt there was no need for Tifa to appear at the hearing. Tifa would ensure that monies from the closing would be put aside so that the sidewalk would get built. The closing was to take place within 30 days of D.E.P. approval.

Per Chairman Pfeil's instructions, Mr. Roberts was informed via email that the Planning Board was requesting him to appear at the August 11, 2015 meeting to report on the status and to explain the details of the proposed closing date on the property. Further, he reminded that no further Administrative Site Plan Waivers would be considered or granted and therefore no new tenants could occupy the site until the sidewalk issue was resolved. Violations of this condition would result in zoning enforcement.

Mr. Roberts responded immediately stating that he understood the conditions and that he hoped the property would be closed by then.

Mr. O'Brien had suggested that the board request a copy of the transaction once it was submitted to the D.E.P. in order to monitor the status between then and August.

There was discussion amongst the board members as to possible alternative solutions should the Tifa property not close.

Mr. Perry stated that, from the county's perspective, he distrusted Tifa. He had no problem giving Tifa until August 11, 2015 however he felt that financially they had caused their own hardship. This had gone on for 30 years plus.

Mr. Hands asked if the board could ask Tifa to provide documentation including the escrow for the sidewalk.

Mr. Perry said that the intent of the letter was to indicate that they were going to put the money up after the closing.

Mr. O'Brien indicated that the board had come up with a figure of \$80,000-\$100,000.

Chairman Pfeil felt that the first step, at Mr. O'Brien's suggestion, was to get a copy of the transaction to the D.E.P.

Mr. Hands still felt that the board should have something in writing stating that the escrow would be a condition of the sale.

Chairman Pfeil asked if Mrs. Wolfe would request that. Ms. Kiefer said that she would tell her.

Mr. Piserchia said that at the last meeting, Mr. Roberts had indicated that when tenants move from one location to another within the site or to get a new tenant in, it was an onerous process and grotesquely expensive--somewhere around \$1500. He had checked with Mrs. Wolfe and there was a nominal application processing fee of \$200. He wanted the public to understand that this was not a long and expensive process as was indicated in the previous meeting.

Mr. O'Brien added that about seven (7) or eight (8) years ago during the township's lawsuit with Tifa in regard to getting tenants in and out of those buildings in a very clear and easy manner, this board created the Administrative Site Plan Waiver. It allowed the applicant to meet with the Administrative Site Plan Waiver Committee which consisted of two (2) people. Those two (2) people would visit the facility to ensure that it did not violate any of the standards of the ordinance and would read the paperwork that was submitted. There was a \$200 application fee. Upon the review of those (2) people, they would sign a letter prepared by the Planning and Zoning Board Administrator which would then allow the change to occur. It would then reported to the board and maintained in Mrs. Wolfe's files. This process would typically take less than 30 days.

Mr. Perry added that the County would issue a report also at no cost.

Mr. O'Brien wanted to add to Mr. Perry's comments. He noted that at a meeting held on August 16, 2014 the attorney for the owner of the property stated that the property would be sold within 30 days to Prism. There was no conditioning language on that statement. Therefore there was no reason to proceed with the discussion since the new owner would take care of it within 30 days.

Chairman Pfeil felt that the board could ask for confirmation on how much would be escrowed and a copy of the transaction that was filed with the D.E.P.

Mr. Roshto asked what the alternatives were should the township not get the escrow.

Mr. O'Brien responded that the board had the ability to ensure that the township got the escrow. Unless the site plan was amended, Tifa would have to follow the site plan. The board could force Tifa to install the sidewalk or the township or county could install the sidewalk at Tifa's expense.

Mr. Roshto asked, if the board made a motion that evening stating that no site plan waivers shall be approved without that escrow amount, would that be sufficient?

Chairman Pfeil advised Mr. Roshto that Mrs. Wolfe had already communicated that to Tifa earlier in the day.

Mr. O'Brien suggested that the board consider what action it might want to take in 60 days since Chairman Pfeil had already allowed Mr. Roberts that amount of time. However, he felt the board should be prepared with a plan of action.

Mr. Piserchia stated he preferred that the township install the sidewalk and then place a lien on the property.

Mr. O'Brien explained that it would go to the Township Committee because the Planning Board had already approved the site plan. He suggested that they check with Mr. Bernstein and Mr. Pidgeon.

Mr. Roshto felt that it would do no harm to recommend that option to the committee.

Mr. O'Brien said that it could be done through a resolution.

Chairman Pfeil said that he had no problem with that after the 60 days. Several of the board members voiced their agreement.

Mr. Hands suggested that the board convey this sentiment to Tifa and advise them that it was a potential consequence. He felt that the last time Tifa appeared before the board, they made it very clear that they were aware that this issue was not going to go away.

Mr. Roshto asked what would happen if the deal went through in 30 days. Why would the board want to see Mr. Roberts in 60 days? The board would want to see the new owner.

Mayor Rae said that in the letter it indicated that the owners would put money aside.

Mr. Perry added that the old site plan would still be in effect until a new one was approved.

Mr. Roshto felt that the board would have no leverage over the previous owners once the property was sold. What legal instrument would the board have *after* the sale?

Mayor Rae said that it would be a condition and the new owners would have to comply with that.

Mr. Piserchia said it was his understanding from rereading the letter that the current owner would receive the money from the sale of the property and the *current owner* would put the money aside for the sidewalks not the *new owner*.

Mr. Roshto indicated that no amount was stated in the letter.

Mr. Hands asked where the escrow money would go and who would have control of the money.

Mr. Perry replied that the escrow money would go to the municipality.

Mr. Hands said that he assumed the money would be transferred upon closing.

Mr. Piserchia asked what the dollar amount would be. \$100,000 seemed to be the consensus.

Chairman Pfeil said that the board wanted from Tifa's attorney a copy of the transaction that was filed with the D.E.P. and a detail of exactly how much money was proposed to be placed in escrow for the sidewalk. The numbers he had from the last meeting were between \$80,000 and \$100,000.

Mayor Rae asked if they should have an estimate or two for the sidewalk.

Mr. O'Brien stated that Mr. Lemanowicz had come up with that figure based on square footage.

Mr. Roshto felt that \$80,000-\$100,000 was not "a number". He wanted an exact number. He also wanted to know how the board could ensure that that money actually went into escrow.

Mr. Perry explained that the money should be placed in a separate account at the time of sale by the attorney for the buyer.

Mr. Moholkar said that Mr. Roshto wanted it explicitly stated that upon sale a certain dollar amount would go to the seller and a certain dollar amount would go into escrow.

Mr. Roshto said that he would be more comfortable if the board came up with an exact number and if the board attorney crafted a letter stating the best way to get the money into the escrow account.

Mr. Roshto added that the Township had been waiting 30 years and at this point the board was allowing 60 more days. He wondered once the 60 days elapsed, how much longer they would have to wait because something didn't go as planned. This had gone on and on and on.

Mayor Rae said that if worst came to worst, the sentiment was that the township would step in and build a sidewalk. Up until now, that sentiment had not been present.

Mr. Piserchia agreed with Mr. Roshto and felt that a letter should be drafted stating that at the time of sale, two (2) checks should be cut and the money be placed in escrow immediately.

Mayor Rae felt that this should be discussed with Mr. Pidgeon because he was unsure as to what enforcement capabilities the Township would have.

Mr. Hands felt they could send a letter stating the intentions of the Township. This would give them ample warning as was done in the previous meeting.

Mr. Wallisch asked if they should be sent to the buyer as well indicating that the board would not approve any future site plan modifications unless a sidewalk was installed. Therefore it would be in their best interest to ensure that the money was put aside.

Chairman Pfeil asked if they could do that since the board had nothing in writing from the proposed buyer. There was no buyer of record as of yet.

Mr. O'Brien said that there was a buyer on contract. He noted that in April 2014 the Township had been told that there was a buyer on contract for the past year and a half. The Prism Corporation who had spoken to this board on one (1) or two (2) occasions was still the buyer of record according to Tifa. Based on discussions that he had heard, he felt that the board should draft a letter to Mr. Bernstein outlining the concerns and what the board would like to happen. Mr. Bernstein could then go to work on a resolution.

Mayor Rae felt that the letter was unnecessary. He would talk to Mr. Pidgeon and Mr. Bernstein the next day.

Dennis Sandow, 29 Windsor Way, asked why they were dealing with the word "escrow." Putting it in an escrow account simply meant that the Township would wind up administering the money so that either the buyer could fix the problem or the Township could fix it itself. He felt that this was a classic real estate "fixer-upper." The seller would be paid less than what he thought it was worth and the buyer would take on all the obligations to get the "furnace back in shape so that it could survive the winter." The buyer should pay the seller what he thought it was worth in its present condition.

Mr. Piserchia asked if the buyer knew about the sidewalk requirement.

Mr. Sandow replied that the board could send the buyer a letter to advise him. The seller's attorney had an obligation to disclose that. If the buyer had done a due diligence study, he would know of this. If not, it would not be difficult to advise him. He did not see the point of escrowing the money and figuring out the exact price of the sidewalk. The Township should not care what the exact price was. The new owner would have to pay whatever it took to install the sidewalk in order to lift the ban on site plan waivers for his new tenants.

Mr. O'Brien stated that he had had conversations with the attorney for Prism and Prism asked about the progress towards the Master Plan in the Millington area. The attorney assured him that Prism was aware of the requirements of the site plan. Second, the word "escrow" was incorrect. The correct term was "performance bond." Typically it would not be the full amount.

Mr. Sandow noted that the Township had not been able to collect on any performance bonds that had failed. He added that the new owner expected that the zoning on that site would be changed to his economic advantage and had been told by his advisors to "be nice to the town because your future depends on it." He expected the new owner to be forthright in getting this solved.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there was any other discussion and noted that at this point no resolution was required.

Mr. O'Brien felt that the consensus of the board members was clear. The next step would be to talk to Mr. Pidgeon and Mr. Bernstein.

Chairman Pfeil moved to the final item on the agenda which was a discussion of proposed ordinance 324-14 which would permit and regulate Sandwich Board signs in Business Zones. He noted that this issue had been open for a long time and that the board had asked for feedback from the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Sandow, as representative of the Chamber of Commerce, set up an example of a sidewalk sign. He explained that in February 2014 a member of the Township Committee brought a proposal to the committee to fully permit sidewalk signs where they were then prohibited. The township attorney drafted an ordinance which was sent to the Planning Board. The board held discussions during both meetings in April. Mr. Sandow said that the ordinance that the Township Committee asked the Planning Board to review had serious problems. He noted that contrary to the belief that the township would be overrun with signs if a moratorium was instituted, there were only 11 businesses participating. The remaining four (4) entities using signs were either churches or township functions for a total of 15 signs during the past 15 months. He felt that that answered the first question which was with the township be overrun with signs and the answer was no.

Mr. Sandow addressed the second question which was whether this would lead to additional clutter on Valley Road. He reviewed the inventory of signs and stated that only three of the signs from the 11 participating businesses were located on Valley Road.

Mr. Sandow noted that in the first sentence of *his* version of sign ordinance, he referred to signs "in front of non-residential uses." Therefore it would not matter what zone the sign was located in as long as it was a non-residential use. The *proposed* ordinance referred to signs in business zones which would not address for example churches which were located in residential zones. He felt that his version which was 195 words was a great simplification.

Chairman Pfeil asked if the recommendation from the Chamber of Commerce was to allow these under the provisions of the proposed revised ordinance 324-14 which Mr. Sandow had written.

Mr. Sandow replied, "Absolutely."

Mr. Perry added one clarification. None of those signs would be allowed in the county's right-of-way.

Mr. O'Brien added, "Or the municipal right-of-way."

Mr. Sandow asked Mr. Perry to lay out the county right-of-way.

Mr. Perry responded that it was 33 feet from the centerline of the road.

Chairman Pfeil noted that that was an excellent point which was why he and some of the others felt that the appropriate action for this would be to refer the proposed ordinance change to the Ordinance Review Subcommittee.

Mr. Sandow stated that he felt the chairman was avoiding the issue. No one knew where the right-of-way boundary was on Long Hill Road in Millington. He felt that it could not be arbitrarily said that the right-of-way was here or there. If one did not know where the right-of-way was plotted, how would one know where *not* to place a sign?

Mr. Perry said that in most cases the county knew exactly where the right-of-way—

Mr. Sandow interrupted and said, "In most cases, but not in Millington."

Mr. Hands asked Mr. Sandow if he was speaking on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Sandow replied, "Yes."

Mr. Hands asked Mr. Sandow if the owners would more fully endorse these signs if they knew there was an permanent ordinance in place.

Mr. Sandow said that a lot of time was spent last spring publicizing the fact that there would be no enforcement and that business people were free to do anything that they wanted to however the Chamber recommended that they follow the guidelines that were set forth in the draft ordinance. As the board members could see from the sample pictures that Mr. Sandow had provided, the businesses had complied. Not as many businesses as Mr. Sandow had expected had joined the program. Aside from the churches, schools and the township, there were only 11 businesses involved. He could not say that doing this on a permanent basis would bring out more businesses. He did not expect there would be less however. He felt that not placing the signs in the right-of-way was very clear. There was ample opportunity in all the locations to place the signs on or near a sidewalk.

Mr. Hands asked for verification that the signs could not remain overnight.

Mr. Sandow responded that that was correct.

Chairman Pfeil said that they did not want the signs outside overnight.

Mr. Sandow stated that half of the signs were out overnight including the ones in front of the churches. He stated that the real issue was whether the signs were perceived as a nuisance by the township's residents. He asked the committee members on the Planning Board if they had received any complaints over the past 15 months.

Neither Mayor Rae nor Mr. Piserchia had received any.

Mr. Sandow stated that given that response he felt that public perception was not weighing on this request in any negative way.

Mr. Hands asked if whatever design standards were created would be agreeable.

Mr. Sandow stated that there were design standards for major ground signs in front of businesses on Valley Road. If one started at Sunrise and then went down to Valley Auto, one would find that only 16% of the ground signs actually met the township's standards. All of the new gas station signs did not meet the township standards. To have a standard for a sign like this did not seem worthwhile. Most of the signs fell into two categories: A-frames or mono strut swinging signs. He added that there were variations-- the signs for the school and the church were homemade. He didn't think that mattered very much.

Mr. Hands asked if signs that rotated or were shiny etcetera would then be excluded.

Mr. Sandow stated that they were all excluded and the township attorney had added that language into the section. Mr. Sandow had taken the liberty of removing it and placing it in the general restriction area at the top of the sign section. "Signs that contain foil, mirrors, lights or reflective material which could create a hazardous condition... are prohibited." That would apply to **all** signs in the township.

Mr. Wallisch asked what Mr. Sandow was proposing to replace the term "sandwich sign" with.

Mr. Sandow said that only the top five (5) signs in the pictures provided were actually A-frames signs. Sandwich board was a type of sidewalk sign so the generic that was being discussed was "sidewalk sign."

Mayor Rae asked if there would be any size restrictions.

Mr. Sandow said that size restrictions were located at the top of the third page, "Sidewalk signs shall be no more than 30 inches in width and 50 inches in height when extended." There was an additional exception for signs located in a sight triangle because the site triangle ordinance 157.5 limited signs to 30 inches high.

Mr. Hands stated that when this issue came up initially, the board had instructed Ms. Kiefer to contact other organizations such as the police department, the fire departments and churches for their input.

Ms. Kiefer replied that she had sent out invitations several times to the churches, the police department, both fire departments, the rescue squad and the Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber was the only organization to respond at any time.

Mr. Sandow explained that the churches were probably unaware that this would pertain to them. He added that he had spoken to both fire department chiefs and they agreed that there was no reason at all for them to comment.

Mr. Wallisch thanked Mr. Sandow for putting this together.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there were any other questions for Mr. Sandow. Seeing none he asked for discussion on how to move forward. He suggested that the ordinance that Mr. Sandow had written be sent to the Ordinance Review Subcommittee. He added that they would try to move this forward very quickly now that Mr. Sandow had put in so much work.

Mayor Rae asked what the subcommittee would do.

Chairman Pfeil answered that it would be reviewed with the professionals since there had been no input as of yet from the board planner or engineer. Now that the county had raised the issue of right-of-way, the subcommittee would request further clarification from the county. His goal was to move it forward quickly and get it on the Planning Board agenda for the July or August meeting.

Mr. Sandow asked Mr. Perry if this type of sign was not permitted in the county right-of-way, what about all the electioneering signs?

Mr. Perry responded that that was a different issue. The county had no control over that due to state law.

Mr. Sandow asked about real estate signs.

Mr. Perry responded that they were not allowed.

Mr. Sandow asked what was allowed, besides political signs.

Mr. Perry responded, "Nothing."

Mr. O'Brien added that campaign signs were protected by the First Amendment.

Mr. Perry said that the only signs allowed were road signs and safety signs.

Mr. Sandow asked about, "Public library this way" signs.

Mr. Perry responded that they were directional signs allowed by the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Sandow asked where he could find a list of signs allowed by the state.

Mr. Perry directed him to the Uniform Traffic Control manual. He added that the state did allow for directional signs for *some* businesses.

Mr. O'Brien said that was typically allowed when there was a change in the roadway by one of the governmental entities which had affected the access to that business. A sign would be put up to make that clearer to the public.

Mr. Sandow said that about two years ago many signs directing people to the Great Swamp were erected in the right-of-ways.

Mr. Perry responded that the county had no control over what the federal government did.

Mr. O'Brien reminded the board in 2012 and continuing since then there had been an open sign discussion concerning directional signs which the Chamber of Commerce originally proposed. The board subsequently recommended that to the Township Committee. These were the "wayfarer" signs.

Mr. Sandow commented that each time he brought this up to a board, another objection was raised. The last time he took it to the Township Committee, the committeemen felt there were too many signs in town. He noted that there were about 1700 signs in the township and there were approximately a half dozen "wayfarer" signs being discussed for businesses located off the main streets.

Chairman Pfeil asked if the board members were in agreement that this would be moved to the Ordinance Review Subcommittee. They agreed. He added that it would be placed on the agenda for next Tuesday's meeting to try to move it forward.

Mayor Rae added that he would move it onto the agenda for the Township Committee as soon as it was finished.

Mayor Rae motioned to adjourn. Mr. Moholkar seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 PM.

Date: _____

Cynthia Kiefer
Planning Board Secretary